

REMARKS

With this amendment, independent claims 1 and 9 have been amended. Claims 1-6, 9 and 12-16 remain pending in the application. All of the pending claims currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Laipply (U.S. 4,696,393) in view of Falaas et al. (U.S. 3,998,654). Support for the amendments to independent claim 1 is found in the specification at page 4, lines 7-17; page 8, lines 7-11. Support for the amendments to independent claim 1 and 9 is found in the specification at page 4, lines 7-17. As such, it is submitted that no new matter has been added to the application by way of this amendment.

Independent claim 1 in amended form recites the limitation "at least one of the first metal substrate and the second substrate receiving said chemical reactant from said applicator prior to the first substrate and the second substrate being brought into contact to initiate anaerobic polymerization therebetween, wherein the second substrate is a material selected from the group consisting of: glass and metal." Likewise, the commercial package of claim 9 incorporates the article of claim 1 in the context of attachment of a vehicle rearview mirror to a vehicle windshield.

As the following remarks will make clear, Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art of record fails to include the claimed limitations that are entitled to patentable weight consideration.

The basis for the rejection of the outstanding claims is that Laipply teaches all of the claim aspects with the exception of failing to disclose the particular chemical reactants being claimed. Falaas et al. is cited to bolster the teachings of Laipply in this regard by teaching metal salts such as organic copper salts useful in detackifying and removing adhesive substances. Thus, the rejection is based on the obviousness to one skilled in the art to incorporate the

detackifying substances of Falaas et al. into the applicator wipes of Laipply because Laipply teaches applicators appropriate for cleaning agents and that Falaas et al. merely teaches a subclass of cleaning agents (see Paper No. 20040930, page 3, paragraphs 2-4).


Applicant submits that Laipply teaches an applicator wipe for fluids “intended for sterilizing, cleaning or like purposes . . . or other purposes; these may include, for example, iodine, perfume, bug repellent, stain remover, insect sting antiseptic, etc.” (Column 1, lines 17-23). Laipply is principally concerned with applying substances to human skin or potentially cleaning an undisclosed other surface. Laipply nowhere contemplates the claimed limitation of applying a chemical reactant to at least one of a metal substrate and a second metal or glass substrate from the applicator prior to reducing anaerobic cure therebetween. Falaas et al. fails to bolster Laipply in this regard since Falaas et al. only teaches application of substances to an adhesive layer in order to facilitate removal of the adhesive. Further, Falaas et al. is rendered inoperative by applying the compositions detailed therein to a glass and/or mount substrate prior to bringing them into contact and initiating anaerobic polymerization therebetween since applying an adhesive remover to a clean substrate has no function, and if the claimed substrate were in fact covered with an adhesive then detackifying the adhesive prior to initiating polymerization therebetween would result in bond failure between the glass and mount substrates.

As the pending claims include limitations that are nowhere found in the prior art, those limitations are submitted to be entitled to patentable weight and therefore this represents a basis by which the pending claims are nonobvious over Laipply in view of Falaas et al. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection as to claims 1-6, 9 and 12-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Laipply in view of Falaas et al. is solicited.

Summary

Claims 1-6, 9 and 12-16 are the claims pending in this application. Independent claims 1 and 9 have been amended by way of this amendment. Each claim is believed to be in proper form and directed to allowable and patentable subject matter. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims is solicited. If the Examiner finds to the contrary, it is respectfully requested that the undersigned in charge of this application be contacted at the telephone number given below in order to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,


Avery N. Goldstein
Registration No. 39,204
Gifford, Krass, Groh, Sprinkle,
Anderson & Citkowski, P.C.
280 N. Old Woodward Ave., Suite 400
Birmingham, MI 48009-5394
(248) 647-6000

Attorney for Applicant


ANG/gs
W:\Word Processing\ang\PIA10302-amd4.doc

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY "EXPRESS MAIL"

"EXPRESS MAIL" MAILING LABEL NUMBER EV602286894 US

DATE OF DEPOSIT January 12, 2005

I hereby certify that this paper or fee (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office To Addressee" Service under 37 CFR 1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.


Janice R. Kuehn